



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/931,280	08/17/2001	Jonas Ohlsson	2380-486	1170

23117 7590 02/26/2007  
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC  
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER
----------

FOX, BRYAN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/26/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/931,280	<b>Applicant(s)</b> OHLSSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Bryan J. Fox	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-10,12 and 14-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-10,14-18,20,22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 9 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muszynski (US006009328A) in view of Jou et al (US006546248B1) and Tiedmann, Jr. et al (US006246673B1).

Regarding claim 1, Muszynski discloses that an inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is initiated when the MS moves from the coverage area of the serving BS 24 connected to the first MSC 14 to the coverage area of a second BS 22 connected to a second MSC 12 and the MS pilot signal quality measurements indicate that a soft handoff to the second BS 22 is appropriate. Diversity signal combining is initiated (see column 9, lines 15-59), which reads on the claimed, "for use in a telecommunications system having a source base station and a destination base station

Art Unit: 2617

where a specified mobile station establishes a connection with the source base station, a method comprising: upon receipt of a first measurement report from the specified mobile station, initiating at the destination base station a preliminary portion of a handover sequence for the specified mobile station.” The inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is terminated if the MS leaves completely the coverage area of one of the participating BSs and penetrates deeply into the coverage area of the other BS and therefore the pilot signal coming from BS 24 has weakened below a predetermined threshold in the previously described inter-MSC soft handoff configuration, which the MS informs the MSC via a pilot signal quality measurement report, and the inter-MSC soft handoff with diversity signal combining is terminated (see column 9, line 60 – column 10, line 30), which reads on the claimed, “upon receipt of a second measurement report from the specified mobile station, initiating at the destination base station another portion of a handover sequence for the specified mobile station.” Muszynski fails to expressly disclose that the first measurement report from the specified mobile station and the second measurement report from the specified station include differing values of a signal quality measurement of a pilot signal from the destination base station as received by the specified mobile station.

In a similar field of endeavor, Jou et al disclose the PSMM contains a number of different pilots (see column 8, lines 35-62).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Muszynski with Jou et al such that the PSMM includes at least both pilot signals in order to provide the complete information of the conditions at the

Art Unit: 2617

mobile station and assist in choosing the most effective operation for the mobile station. The combination of Muszynski and Jou et al fails to expressly disclose the preliminary portion of a handover sequence including uplink radio synchronization with respect to the specified mobile station.

In a similar field of endeavor, Tiedmann, Jr. et al disclose a pilot strength measurement report triggers the target base station to fix timing error between it and the mobile station in the forward link (see column 17, lines 28-49).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al with Tiedmann, Jr. et al to include the above fixing the timing error in order to provide a faster transition as suggested by Tiedmann, Jr. et al (see column 7, lines 34-49).

Regarding claim 9, Muszynski discloses that an inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is initiated when the MS moves from the coverage area of the serving BS 24 connected to the first MSC 14 to the coverage area of a second BS 22 connected to a second MSC 12 and the MS pilot signal quality measurements indicate that a soft handoff to the second BS 22 is appropriate. Diversity signal combining is initiated (see column 9, lines 15-59), which reads on the claimed, "a telecommunications system comprising a control node and a destination base station, wherein: the control node is configured to initiate at the destination base station, upon receipt of a first measurement report from the specified mobile station, a preliminary portion of a handover sequence for the specified mobile station." The inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is terminated if the MS leaves completely the

Art Unit: 2617

coverage area of one of the participating BSs and penetrates deeply into the coverage area of the other BS and therefore the pilot signal coming from BS 24 has weakened below a predetermined threshold in the previously described inter-MSC soft handoff configuration, which the MS informs the MSC via a pilot signal quality measurement report, and the inter-MSC soft handoff with diversity signal combining is terminated (see column 9, line 60 – column 10, line 30), which reads on the claimed, “upon receipt of a second measurement report from the specified mobile station to initiate at the destination base station another portion of a handover sequence for the specified mobile station.” Muszynski fails to expressly disclose that the first measurement report from the specified mobile station and the second measurement report from the specified station include differing values of a signal quality measurement of a pilot signal from the destination base station as received by the specified mobile station.

In a similar field of endeavor, Jou et al disclose the PSMM contains a number of different pilots (see column 8, lines 35-62).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Muszynski with Jou et al such that the PSMM includes at least both pilot signals in order to provide the complete information of the conditions at the mobile station and assist in choosing the most effective operation for the mobile station. The combination of Muszynski and Jou et al fails to expressly disclose the preliminary portion of a handover sequence including uplink radio synchronization with respect to the specified mobile station.

In a similar field of endeavor, Tiedmann, Jr. et al disclose a pilot strength measurement report triggers the target base station to fix timing error between it and the mobile station in the forward link (see column 17, lines 28-49).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al with Tiedmann, Jr. et al to include the above fixing the timing error in order to provide a faster transition as suggested by Tiedmann, Jr. et al (see column 7, lines 34-49).

Regarding claim 18, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses the handoff begins with the MS sending signal quality measurements indicating that a soft handoff is appropriate. The MSC passes an inter-MSC soft handoff request to the second MSC, which passes this handoff request further on to the BS (see column 9, lines 10-59), which reads on the claimed, "sending an uplink setup request message from a control node to the destination base stations." The BSA will further start demodulating the CDMA uplink connection (see column 9, lines 10-59), which reads on the claimed, "turning on a receiver at the destination base station to listen to the specified mobile station and the destination base station." The BS will start relaying the user communication signals back to the MSC (see Muszynski column 9, lines 10-59), which reads on the claimed, "sending a mobile station detected message from the destination base station to the control node." The combination of Muszynski and Jou et al fails to expressly disclose the preliminary portion of a handover sequence including uplink radio synchronization with respect to the specified mobile station.

In a similar field of endeavor, Tiedmann, Jr. et al disclose a pilot strength measurement report triggers the target base station to fix timing error between it and the mobile station in the forward link (see column 17, lines 28-49).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al with Tiedmann, Jr. et al to include the above fixing the timing error in order to provide a faster transition as suggested by Tiedmann, Jr. et al (see column 7, lines 34-49).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses the handoff begins with the MS sending signal quality measurements indicating that a soft handoff is appropriate. The MSC passes an inter-MSC soft handoff request to the second MSC, which passes this handoff request further on to the BS (see column 9, lines 10-59), which reads on the claimed, "receiving at the destination base station an uplink setup request message from the control node." The BS will further start demodulating the CDMA uplink connection (see column 9, lines 10-59), which reads on the claimed, "turning on a receiver at the destination base station to listen to the specified mobile station and the destination base station." The BS will start relaying the user communication signals back to the MSC (see Muszynski column 9, lines 10-59), which reads on the claimed, "sending a mobile station detected message from the destination base station to the control node." The combination of Muszynski and Jou et al fails to expressly disclose the preliminary portion of a handover sequence including uplink radio synchronization with respect to the specified mobile station.



In a similar field of endeavor, Tiedmann, Jr. et al disclose a pilot strength measurement report triggers the target base station to fix timing error between it and the mobile station in the forward link (see column 17, lines 28-49).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al with Tiedmann, Jr. et al to include the above fixing the timing error in order to provide a faster transition as suggested by Tiedmann, Jr. et al (see column 7, lines 34-49).

Claims 2, 4, 6-8, 10, 12 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muszynski in view of Jou et al.

Regarding claim 2, Muszynski discloses that an inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is initiated when the MS moves from the coverage area of the serving BS 24 connected to the first MSC 14 to the coverage area of a second BS 22 connected to a second MSC 12 and the MS pilot signal quality measurements indicate that a soft handoff to the second BS 22 is appropriate. Diversity signal combining is initiated (see column 9, lines 15-59), which reads on the claimed, "for use in a telecommunications system having a source base station and a destination base station where a specified mobile station establishes a connection with the source base station, a method comprising: upon receipt of a first measurement report from the specified mobile station, initiating at the destination base station a preliminary portion of a handover sequence for the specified mobile station." The inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is terminated if the MS leaves completely the coverage area

Art Unit: 2617

of one of the participating BSs and penetrates deeply into the coverage area of the other BS and therefore the pilot signal coming from BS 24 has weakened below a predetermined threshold in the previously described inter-MSC soft handoff configuration, which the MS informs the MSC via a pilot signal quality measurement report, and the inter-MSC soft handoff with diversity signal combining is terminated (see column 9, line 60 – column 10, line 30), which reads on the claimed, “upon receipt of a second measurement report from the specified mobile station, initiating at the destination base station another portion of a handover sequence for the specified mobile station,” and, “the preliminary portion of the handover sequence involving an operation between the destination base station and the specified mobile station that are more time critical than operations performed during the another portion of the handover sequence.” Muszynski fails to expressly disclose that the first measurement report from the specified mobile station and the second measurement report from the specified station include differing values of a signal quality measurement of a pilot signal from the destination base station as received by the specified mobile station.

In a similar field of endeavor, Jou et al disclose the PSMM contains a number of different pilots (see column 8, lines 35-62).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Muszynski with Jou et al such that the PSMM includes at least both pilot signals in order to provide the complete information of the conditions at the mobile station and assist in choosing the most effective operation for the mobile station.

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses that BS 22 will further start demodulating the CDMA uplink connection after the first PSMM (see Muszynski column 9, lines 16-45), which reads on the claimed, "upon receipt of the first measurement report from the specified mobile station, a control node allocates uplink resources for the specified mobile station to communicate with the destination base station."

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses that BS 22 will further start demodulating the CDMA uplink connection after the first PSMM in response to a handoff request from the MSC (see Muszynski column 9, lines 16-45), which reads on the claimed, "the preliminary portion of the handover sequence comprises...sending an uplink setup request message from a control node to the destination base station."

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses the inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is terminated if the MS leaves completely the coverage area of one of the participating BSs and penetrates deeply into the coverage area of the other BS and therefore the pilot signal coming from BS 24 has weakened below a predetermined threshold in the previously described inter-MSC soft handoff configuration, which the MS informs the MSC via a pilot signal quality measurement report, and the inter-MSC soft handoff with diversity signal combining is terminated (see column 9, line 60 – column 10, line 30), which reads on the claimed, "the another portion of the handover sequence comprises remaining events of a

conventional handover sequence which were not included in the preliminary portion of the handover sequence.”

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses upon termination of the soft handover the MSC sends a termination message via the base stations to the MS and signal diversity combining is stopped (see column 10, lines 6-54), which reads on the claimed, “the another portion of the handover sequence comprises...transferring user data between the control node and the destination base station,” wherein the termination message would need to include identifying information of the terminal, which reads on the claimed, “user data.”

Regarding claim 10, Muszynski discloses that an inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is initiated when the MS moves from the coverage area of the serving BS 24 connected to the first MSC 14 to the coverage area of a second BS 22 connected to a second MSC 12 and the MS pilot signal quality measurements indicate that a soft handoff to the second BS 22 is appropriate. Diversity signal combining is initiated (see column 9, lines 15-59), which reads on the claimed, “telecommunications system comprising a control node and a destination base station, characterized in that: the control node is configured to initiate at the destination base station, upon receipt of a first measurement report from the specified mobile station, a preliminary portion of a handover sequence for the specified mobile station.” The inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is terminated if the MS leaves completely the coverage area of one of the participating BSs and penetrates deeply into the coverage area of the other BS and therefore the pilot signal coming from BS 24 has weakened below a

predetermined threshold in the previously described inter-MS soft handoff configuration, which the MS informs the MSC via a pilot signal quality measurement report, and the inter-MS soft handoff with diversity signal combining is terminated (see column 9, line 60 – column 10, line 30), which reads on the claimed, “upon receipt of a second measurement report from the specified mobile station to initiate at the destination base station another portion of a handover sequence for the specified mobile station,” and, “the destination base station, in performing the preliminary portion of the handover sequence is configured to perform operations which are more time critical than operations included in the another portion of the handover sequence.” Muszynski fails to expressly disclose that the first measurement report from the specified mobile station and the second measurement report from the specified station include differing values of a signal quality measurement of a pilot signal from the destination base station as received by the specified mobile station.

In a similar field of endeavor, Jou et al disclose the PSMM contains a number of different pilots (see column 8, lines 35-62).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Muszynski with Jou et al such that the PSMM includes at least both pilot signals in order to provide the complete information of the conditions at the mobile station and assist in choosing the most effective operation for the mobile station.

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses that BS 22 will further start demodulating the CDMA uplink connection after the first PSMM (see Muszynski column 9, lines 16-45), which reads on the claimed, “upon receipt of the

first measurement report from the specified mobile station, a control node is configured to allocate uplink resources for the specified mobile station to communicate with the destination base station."

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses that BS 22 will further start demodulating the CDMA uplink connection after the first PSMM in response to a handoff request from the MSC (see Muszynski column 9, lines 16-45), which reads on the claimed, "the preliminary portion of the handover sequence comprises...receiving at the destination base station an uplink setup request message sent from the control node."

Regarding claim 15, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses the inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is terminated if the MS leaves completely the coverage area of one of the participating BSs and penetrates deeply into the coverage area of the other BS and therefore the pilot signal coming from BS 24 has weakened below a predetermined threshold in the previously described inter-MSC soft handoff configuration, which the MS informs the MSC via a pilot signal quality measurement report, and the inter-MSC soft handoff with diversity signal combining is terminated (see column 9, line 60 – column 10, line 30), which reads on the claimed, "the another portion of the handover sequence comprises remaining events of a conventional handover sequence which were not included in the preliminary portion of the handover sequence."

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses upon termination of the soft handover the MSC sends a termination message via the base

Art Unit: 2617

stations to the MS and signal diversity combining is stopped (see column 10, lines 6-54), which reads on the claimed, "the another portion of the handover sequence comprises...transferring user data between the control node and the destination base station," wherein the termination message would need to include identifying information of the terminal, which reads on the claimed, "user data."

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al discloses that the control node is a MSC (see figure 1), which reads on the claimed, "the control node is a radio network control node of a radio access network."

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muszynski in view of Jou et al as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Agre (US005978679A).

Regarding claim 22, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al disclose an inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is initiated when the MS moves from the coverage area of the serving BS 24 connected to the first MSC 14 to the coverage area of a second BS 22 connected to a second MSC 12 and the MS pilot signal quality measurements indicate that a soft handoff to the second BS 22 is appropriate. Diversity signal combining is initiated (see Muszynski column 9, lines 15-59), which reads on the claimed, "for use in a telecommunications system having a source base station and a destination base station where a specified mobile station establishes a connection with the source base station, a method comprising: upon receipt of the first measurement report from the specified mobile station, initiating at the

Art Unit: 2617

destination base station a preliminary portion of a handover sequence for establishing a connection leg between the destination base station and the specified mobile station.”

The combination of Muszynski and Jou et al fails to expressly disclose upon receipt of the second measurement report from the specified mobile station, initiating at the destination base station the another portion of the handover sequence for establishing the connection leg between the destination base station and the specified mobile station.

In a similar field of endeavor, Agre discloses the use of multiple pilot measurement reports in establishing a connection (see column 7, line 4 – column 9, line 15) and specifically discloses a second measurement report triggers a handover (see column 8, line 50 – column 9, line 15), which reads on the claimed, “upon receipt of the second measurement report from the specified mobile station, initiating at the destination base station the another portion of the handover sequence for establishing the connection leg between the destination base station and the specified mobile station.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al with Agre to include the above use of multiple measurement reports in a handover in order to allow subscribers to switch from one type of service to another during the course of a call as suggested by Agre (see column 9, line 66 – column 10, line 16)

Regarding claim 23, the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al disclose an inter-MSC soft handoff with signal diversity combining is initiated when the MS moves



Art Unit: 2617

from the coverage area of the serving BS 24 connected to the first MSC 14 to the coverage area of a second BS 22 connected to a second MSC 12 and the MS pilot signal quality measurements indicate that a soft handoff to the second BS 22 is appropriate. Diversity signal combining is initiated (see Muszynski column 9, lines 15-59), which reads on the claimed, "for use in a telecommunications system having a source base station and a destination base station where a specified mobile station establishes a connection with the source base station, a method comprising: upon receipt of the first measurement report from the specified mobile station, initiating at the destination base station a preliminary portion of a handover sequence for establishing a connection leg between the destination base station and the specified mobile station." The combination of Muszynski and Jou et al fails to expressly disclose upon receipt of the second measurement report from the specified mobile station, initiating at the destination base station the another portion of the handover sequence for establishing the connection leg between the destination base station and the specified mobile station.

In a similar field of endeavor, Agre discloses the use of multiple pilot measurement reports in establishing a connection (see column 7, line 4 – column 9, line 15) and specifically discloses a second measurement report triggers a handover (see column 8, line 50 – column 9, line 15), which reads on the claimed, "upon receipt of the second measurement report from the specified mobile station, initiating at the destination base station the another portion of the handover sequence for establishing

Art Unit: 2617

the connection leg between the destination base station and the specified mobile station.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Muszynski and Jou et al with Agre to include the above use of multiple measurement reports in a handover in order to allow subscribers to switch from one type of service to another during the course of a call as suggested by Agre (see column 9, line 66 – column 10, line 16).

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 19 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the applied references fail to teach or suggest the another portion of the handover sequence comprises the claimed subject matter.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed November 22, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues the claims distinguish over Muszynski. The Examiner has relied upon the combination of at least Muszynski and Jou et al to reject the claimed invention.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan J. Fox whose telephone number is (571) 272-7908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles N. Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Bryan Fox  
February 19, 2007

  
CHARLES APPIAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER